1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SHERMAN DIVISION			
3	UNITED STATES OF AMER	RICA	DOCKET 4:20-CR-318	
4			 OCTOBER 4, 2022	
5	VS.		9:02 A.M.	
6	KEITH TODD ASHLEY		 SHERMAN, TEXAS	
7				
8	VOLUME 7 OF 8, PAGES 1638 THROUGH 1703			
9	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL			
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE AMOS L. MAZZANT, III,			
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY			
12	FOD THE COMPONMENT.	HEATHER HARRIS RATTAN JAY COMBS U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE - PLANO 101 E. PARK BOULEVARD, SUITE 500 PLANO, TX 75074		
13	FOR THE GOVERNMENT.			
14				
15		JASON FINE	73074	
16		DALLAS COUNTY D.A.'S OFFICE 133 N. RIVERFRONT BOULEVARD DALLAS, TX 75207		
17				
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	TAMES D MI	TATEN	
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	JAMES P. WHALEN RYNE THOMAS SANDEL WHALEN LAW OFFICE 9300 JOHN HICKMAN PKWY, SUITE 501 FRISCO, TX 75035		
20				
21		rkibco, TX	73033	
22	COURT REPORTER:	CHRISTINA L. BICKHAM, CRR, RDR FEDERAL OFFICIAL REPORTER 101 EAST PECAN SHERMAN, TX 75090		
23				
24		SHERMAN, T	X /5U9U	
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED USING MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY; TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED VIA COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION.			

1	INDEX	
2		
3		PAGE
4	Court's Instructions to the Jury	1648
5	Note Number 1	1689
6	Note Number 2	1689
7	Note Number 3	1693
8	Note Number 4	1694
9	Note Number 5	1698
10	Note Number 6	1702
11	COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION	1703
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
(Open court, defendant present, jury not present.)
 1
 2
            THE COURT:
                        It's my understanding there was an
   issue you wanted to raise before we begin?
 3
 4
            MR. WHALEN:
                        We did, your Honor. You received the
 5
            We sent it to the Court, copied the government on
   it and --
 6
 7
            THE COURT:
                        I did see it, yes.
 8
            MR. WHALEN:
                        Okay. And so there was a
 9
   representation made during the closing argument of the
10
   government that showed a picture of Mr. Ashley's -- or was
11
   his house that showed this pool, and there was comments
12
   made that that's where everybody's money went.
13
            Looking at the Collin County Appraisal District,
   that pool was added after he sold the home; so it was
14
15
   extremely misleading to the jury and should be corrected
16
   that that is not an accurate representation of his home at
17
   the time of the offense that they have alleged was
18
   committed.
                        Well, Mr. Whalen, if you had objected,
19
            THE COURT:
20
   of course, the Court would have said it's up to the jury to
21
   decide what the facts of the case are so -- and the Court
22
   has instructions in there that indicates what the lawyers
23
   say is not evidence.
                          I don't know that any kind of
24
   instruction is necessary.
25
            MR. WHALEN: Well, I think there is an exhibit --
```

```
1
   the Google Earth exhibit is in evidence and so -- based on
 2
   that animation that they did, that came off of that exhibit
   that's in evidence; and so there is an exhibit in evidence
 3
 4
   that misrepresents the status of his home at the time of
   the offense.
 5
 6
                               So -- well, I thought it was
            THE COURT: Okay.
 7
   just argument. I didn't realize -- so there is an exhibit
 8
   that, I quess, was not objected to?
            MR. WHALEN:
                         I believe there is an exhibit -- I
   believe it is based off the exhibit that he --
10
11
            THE COURT:
                        I thought it was just a demonstrative.
12
   I don't believe it was -- I don't believe it was something
13
   that was admitted. So I guess let me ask the government.
14
            I thought it was just a demonstrative.
                         I think we offered it for all
15
            MS. RATTAN:
   purposes. It's Government's Exhibit 97 and we offered it
16
17
   yesterday morning or, rather -- anyway, it was offered in
18
   Agent Rennie's testimony. It's part of Government's -- or
   was offered along with Government's Exhibit 134.
19
20
   97.
21
            Your Honor, may I be heard while the Court is
22
   looking?
23
            THE COURT:
                        Yes.
24
            MS. RATTAN: Of course, whether it's demonstrative
25
   or whether it's actually offered for all purposes, the
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time, as the Court was pointing out, to make the objection was when it was offered or when it was reviewed with a witness; and that, even then, would go to the weight and not the admissibility. And the cross-examination is, "This isn't accurate" and point out the things that he's pointed out. And certainly he could have objected, as the Court points out, during closing argument as he did twice. Those would be the times to handle those issues. But I do want the Court to know we were not intentionally attempting to misrepresent anything and that was taken from Google Earth and the argument was based on something that was admitted, either for all purposes or demonstrative purposes; and that's fair argument. So he had the opportunity during objecting to the exhibit, cross-examining on the exhibit, or even in his Three separate opportunities to make these points, and they weren't made. THE COURT: Well, if it was just argument and a demonstrative in terms of -- the objection is not waived by -- the objection just has to be made before the case goes to the jury, which hasn't happened yet. different situation if it's a fully admitted exhibit, which is what I'm trying to figure out. 97 was, I think, fully admitted. But I don't have

```
1
   it in my book, so I'm trying to --
 2
            MS. RATTAN: It's the animation, I'm sure the
   Court knows.
 3
            THE COURT: No, I understand; but I'm just trying
 4
   to see the slide that shows the house.
 5
 6
            Mr. Whalen, what about that? I mean, if it's a
7
   fully admitted exhibit --
 8
            MR. WHALEN: Well, we did lodge objections to the
   exhibit; so objections were made to the exhibit.
 9
10
            THE COURT: But this objection wasn't made.
11
            MR. WHALEN: No -- well, here's the point.
12
   maybe, you know, my view of the world is skewed. But I
13
   have to believe that when the government -- when they offer
   exhibits, they review exhibits and in good faith offer them
14
15
   knowing them to be accurate.
16
            But we objected to it. They pointed it out.
   didn't -- based on what they showed, we didn't see that
17
18
   there was -- going to zoom in on a Google Earth.
                                                      It showed
19
   this animation of it going over, not that they were
20
   introducing these Google Earth exhibits that now you can
21
   blow up that the jury is just not going to -- whether
22
   they're going to be able to do that or not. That's not how
23
   it was represented. It's just animation that shows the
24
   movement of this, simply that, not the ability to then zoom
25
   in on everything based on what they represented the exhibit
```

```
1
   was.
 2
            And so to then get up and then zoom in on it and
   then have the jury have the ability to do that, they can
 3
 4
   manipulate the exhibit and --
                        Well, I don't think they have the
 5
            THE COURT:
   ability back in the jury room, actually. They can play it,
 6
7
   but they won't have the ability to zoom in.
 8
            But, Ms. Rattan, can you show me the slide that is
   at issue?
10
            MS. RATTAN:
                        And what we're going to pull up, your
11
   Honor, is the slide from closing?
12
            THE COURT:
                        Yes.
13
            MS. RATTAN: Okay.
14
            THE COURT:
                        Okay. I see that so -- and is that
15
   same picture in the admitted Exhibit 97?
16
            MS. RATTAN: It was taken off of Exhibit 97, yes,
17
   your Honor.
18
            THE COURT: But in terms of 97, that's -- the
19
   demonstrative you used for closing has been blown up,
20
   correct?
            MS. RATTAN: Well, yes, but I would point out that
21
22
   when we presented 97 with Special Agent Rennie, we
   specifically paused on this depiction of the house.
23
24
            THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Rattan, of course, I'm
25
   not sure -- well, Mr. Whalen, I quess, I should address.
```

```
I'm not sure what you want the Court to do.
 1
 2
   mean, this exhibit has been fully admitted.
                                                 The fact that
   the pool wasn't -- I mean, the record is closed so it's
 3
   part of the record and it's been admitted. The objection
   you made had nothing to do regarding it was inaccurate
   so -- in terms of the timing. It is an accurate depiction
 6
 7
   of the house, I quess, when it was taken. The fact that
 8
   the pool wasn't done until after all this happened -- I
   don't know what you want me to do about that.
                        Well, your Honor, I think what we
10
            MR. WHALEN:
11
   would like you to do is that the jury be instructed that
12
   that was not a representation of his house at the time the
13
   offense was alleged to have been committed.
14
            THE COURT: And my question is why should I do
15
   that when you've never raised that in a timely manner?
                         Well, because --
16
            MR. WHALEN:
17
                        And this was admitted as an exhibit.
            THE COURT:
18
            MR. WHALEN:
                         Well, it was -- one, it was not part
19
   of the exhibit. The exhibit was simply an overview of
20
   showing his travel from -- the phone's travel from his
21
   house to there. It never zoomed in on any particular
22
   objects or anything like that.
23
            THE COURT:
                        So what you're saying is this picture
24
   is not part of the -- so the jury --
25
            MR. WHALEN: Not the way they presented it to the
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
And so they would have presented it to the jury on
the animation, it didn't zoom in and say, okay, this was
the start part and let's go from --
        THE COURT: Okay. I quess let me clear it up with
the government. Is this slide part of 97?
        MS. RATTAN:
                    Yes, your Honor, it is.
        THE COURT:
                    Okay.
        MS. RATTAN: And I would also say that when we
played 97 with Agent Rennie, we specifically paused on the
scene that depicts the defendant's house.
        THE COURT: Okay. Well -- and so what does the
government want? This is your record to protect on appeal,
so you tell me.
        MS. RATTAN:
                    We think the record is fine, your
        The defendant had ample, multiple opportunities to
make these objections when it was offered.
cross-examination and then nothing in closing argument
after Mr. Combs made the argument.
        The other thing is the estate is accurate.
fact that there is a pool there that the defendant is
saying Collin County records show was placed there after he
moved out is really de minimis because, as we can all see,
it's a large estate and a large house.
        THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm going to overrule the
objection so --
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WHALEN: All right. And, your Honor, just so the record is clear, we're objecting to that and we are objecting because it does deny him a right to a fair trial under the Sixth Amendment and we would object on those --There is no basis for that in any way, THE COURT: but I understand you want to make your objection. Again, you had the ability to object to this both when the exhibit was offered as -- and you didn't as to this basis and -- plus, in my view, it is an accurate depiction of the house. So the fact that the pool wasn't put in until 2021, in my view, is -- was that the correct date, 2021? MR. WHALEN: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. But I just don't see an issue here so -- it's really a minor issue in the scheme of things of the case, so I'm going to overrule your objection. Anything else? MR. WHALEN: Yes, your Honor. Could we make the attachment to the email I sent to the Court a part of the record as well as the government's slide as part of the And I can print it out if I need to but -record, please. THE COURT: Well, print the email out; and we can certainly make that part of the record, if you so desire. I don't know if they can print the page from the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
And actually probably you're going to provide us a
slides.
copy of all of the slides anyway, aren't you, as part of
the record since it's part --
        MS. RATTAN:
                    Yes.
        THE COURT:
                    It's not part of the evidence record,
but it's part of what the jury got to see as a
demonstrative so they'll have -- that will be part of the
record --
                    All right. Thank you, your Honor.
        MR. WHALEN:
        THE COURT: -- for appeal purposes.
               Anything from the government?
        MS. RATTAN:
                    No, your Honor.
        THE COURT: Okay. Let's bring the jury in.
        (The jury enters the courtroom, 9:13 a.m.)
        THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.
        Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to
have my lawyer give you each a copy of the
Court's instructions. The law requires me to read these in
open court, but you will have a copy to follow along and
take back with you when you begin deliberations.
        Members of the jury, now that you have heard all
the evidence in this case, it becomes my duty to give you
the instructions of the Court as to the law applicable to
this case.
        In any jury trial there are, in effect, two
```

judges. I am one of the judges; the other is you, the jury. It is my duty to preside over the trial and to determine what testimony and evidence is proper for your consideration. It is also my duty at the end of the trial to explain to you the rules of law that you must follow and apply in arriving at your verdict.

First, I will give you some general instructions which apply in every case, for example, instructions about the burden of proof and how to judge the believability of the witnesses. Then I will give you some specific rules of law about this particular case, and finally I will explain to you the procedures you should follow in your deliberations.

You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts. But in determining what actually happened -- that is, in reaching your decision as to the facts -- it is your sworn duty to follow all the rules of law as I explain them to you.

You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction or to question the wisdom or correctness of any rule that I may state to you. You must not substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you, regardless of the consequences.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted by the parties as jurors, and they have the right to expect nothing less.

The Indictment or formal charge against a defendant is not evidence of guilt. Indeed, the defendant is presumed by the law to be innocent. The defendant begins with a clean slate. The law does not require a defendant to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence at all, and no inference whatever may be drawn from the election of the defendant not to testify.

The government has the burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; and if it fails to do so, you must acquit the defendant. While the government's burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, it is not necessary that the defendant's guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the government's proof exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the defendant's guilt.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without

hesitation in making the most important decisions of your own affairs.

Now, as I told you earlier, it is your duty to determine the facts. To do so, you must consider only the evidence presented during the trial. Evidence is the sworn testimony of the witnesses, including stipulations, and the exhibits. The questions, statements, objections, and arguments made by the lawyers are not evidence.

The function of the lawyers is to point out those things that are most significant or most helpful to their side of the case and, in doing so, to call your attention to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your notice. In the final analysis, however, it is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls in the case. What the lawyers say is not binding upon you.

Now, during the trial I sustained objections to certain questions or exhibits. You must disregard those questions and exhibits entirely. Do not speculate as to what the witness would have said if permitted to answer the question or as to the contents of an exhibit. Your verdict must be based solely on the legally admissible evidence and testimony.

Also, do not assume from anything that I have done or said during the trial that I have an opinion concerning

any of the issues in this case. Except for the instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything that I have said during the trial in arriving at your verdict.

Now, in considering the evidence, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts which have been established by the evidence.

Do not be concerned about whether evidence is direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. You should consider and weigh all of the evidence that was presented to you.

Direct evidence is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of events and circumstances indicating that something is, or is not, a fact.

The law makes no distinction between the weight you may give to either direct or circumstantial evidence; but the law requires that you, after weighing all of the evidence, whether direct or circumstantial, be convinced of the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt before

1 you can find him quilty. 2 I remind you that it is your job to decide whether the government has proved the guilt of the defendant beyond 3 4 a reasonable doubt. In doing so, you must consider all of 5 the evidence. This does not mean, however, that you must accept all of the evidence as true or accurate. 6 7 You are the sole judges of the credibility or 8 believability of each witness and the weight to be given to the witness' testimony. An important part of your job will 10 be making judgments about the testimony of the witnesses 11 who testified in this case. You should decide whether you 12 believe all, some part, or none of what each person had to 13 say and how important that testimony was. In making that 14 decision, I suggest you ask yourself a few questions: 15 Did the witness impress you as honest? 16 Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? 17 18 Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? 19 20 Did the witness have any relationship with either 21 the government or the defense? 22 Did the witness seem to have a good memory? 23 Did the witness clearly see or hear the things 24 about which he or she testified? 25 Did the witness have the opportunity and ability

1 to understand the questions clearly and answer them 2 directly? Did the witness' testimony differ from the 3 4 testimony of other witnesses? These are a few of the considerations that will 5 help you determine the accuracy of what each witness said. 6 7 Your job is to think about the testimony of each 8 witness you have heard and decide how much you believe of what each witness had to say. In making up your mind and reaching a verdict, do not make any decisions simply 10 11 because there were more witnesses on one side than on the 12 other. Do not reach a conclusion on a particular point 13 just because there were more witnesses testifying for one 14 side on that point. You will always bear in mind that the 15 law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the 16 burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any 17 evidence. 18 The defendant has an absolute right not to 19 The fact that a defendant does not testify should testify. 20 not be considered by you in any way or even discussed in 21 your deliberations. I remind you that it is up to the 22 government to prove the defendant's quilt beyond a 23 reasonable doubt. It is not up to the defendant to prove 24 that he is not quilty. 25 Now, the testimony of a witness may be discredited

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

concerning such matters.

by showing that the witness testified falsely or by evidence that at some other time the witness said or did something, or failed to say or do something, which was inconsistent with the testimony the witness gave at trial. Earlier statements of a witness were not admitted in evidence to prove that the contents of those statements are true. You may not consider the earlier statements to prove that the content of an earlier statement is true; you may only use earlier statements to determine whether you think the earlier statements are consistent or inconsistent with the trial testimony of the witness and, therefore, whether they affect the credibility of that witness. If you believe that a witness has been discredited in this manner, it is your exclusive right to give the testimony of that witness whatever weight you think it deserves. Now, during the trial you heard the testimony of witnesses who were presented to you as an expert in a certain field. If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in

Merely because such a witness has expressed an

issue, a witness qualified by knowledge, skill, experience,

training, or education may testify and state an opinion

opinion does not mean, however, that you must accept this opinion. You should judge such testimony like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it and give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness' education and experience, the soundness of the reasons given for the opinion, and all other evidence in the case.

You will note that the Fourth Superseding

Indictment charges that the offense was committed on or
about a specified date or during a specific period of time.

The government does not have to prove that the crime was
committed on those exact dates so long as the government
proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant
committed the crime on a date reasonably near the dates
stated in the Fourth Superseding Indictment for each count.

You are here to decide whether the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the crime charged. The defendant is not on trial for any act, conduct, or offense not alleged in the Fourth Superseding Indictment. Neither are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this case except as you are otherwise instructed.

Now, if the defendant is found guilty, it will be my duty to decide what the punishment will be. You should

not be concerned with punishment in any way. It should not enter your consideration or discussion.

A separate crime is charged in each count of the Fourth Superseding Indictment. Each count, and the evidence pertaining to it, should be considered separately. The fact that you might find the defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the crimes charged should not control your verdict as to any other count.

You have heard evidence of acts of the defendant which may be similar to those charged in the Indictment but which were committed on other occasions. You must not consider any of this evidence in deciding if the defendant committed the acts charged in the Indictment. However, you may consider the evidence for other, very limited purposes.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt from other evidence in this case that the defendant did commit the acts charged in the Indictment, then you may consider evidence of similar acts allegedly committed on other occasions to determine:

One, whether the defendant had the state of mind or intent necessary to commit the crime charged in the Fourth Superseding Indictment; or,

Two, whether the defendant had the motive or the opportunity to commit the acts charged in the Indictment; or,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Three, whether the defendant acted according to a plan or in preparation for commission of a crime; or, Four, whether the defendant committed the acts for which he is on trial by accident or mistake. These are the limited purposes for which any evidence of other similar acts may be considered. Now, some exhibits have been identified as typewritten transcripts of oral conversations which can be heard on tape recordings received in evidence. transcripts also purport to identify the speakers engaged in such conversations. I have admitted the transcript for the limited and secondary purpose of aiding you in following the content of the conversation as you listen to the tape recording and to also aid you in identifying the speakers. You are specifically instructed that whether the transcript correctly, or incorrectly, reflects the content of the conversation or the identity of the speakers is entirely for you to determine based upon your own evaluation of the testimony you have heard concerning the preparation of the transcript and from your own examination of the transcript in relation to your hearing of the tape recording itself as the primary evidence of its own contents; and if you should determine that the transcript

in any respect is incorrect or unreliable, you should

disregard it to that extent. It is what you hear on the tape that is evidence, not the transcripts.

Now, certain charts and summaries have been shown to you solely as an aid to help you explain the facts disclosed by the evidence, which is the testimony, books, records, and other documents in the case. These charts and summaries are not admitted evidence or proof of any facts. You should determine the facts from the evidence that has been admitted.

Now, certain charts and summaries of other records have been received into evidence. They should be considered like any other evidence in the case. You should give them only such weight as you think they deserve.

The charts and summaries include inferences or conclusions drawn from the records underlying them. It is up to you to determine if these inferences or conclusions are accurate.

Summary testimony by a witness and charts or summaries prepared or relied upon by the witness have been received into evidence for the purpose of explaining facts disclosed by testimony and exhibits which are also in evidence in this case.

If you find that such summary testimony and charts correctly reflect the other evidence the case, you may rely upon them. But if and to the extent that you find they are

not in truth summaries of the evidence in the case, you are to disregard them. The best evidence of what occurred are the underlying records themselves.

As used in these instructions, a representation, statement, or pretense is "material" if it has a natural tendency to influence, or is capable of influencing, the decision of the person to which it is addressed. The government may prove materiality in either of two ways.

First, a representation, statement, or pretense is "material" if a reasonable person would attach importance to its existence or nonexistence in determining his or her choice of action in the transaction in question.

Second, a statement could be material, even though only an unreasonable person would rely upon it, if the person who made the statement knew or had reason to know his victim was likely to rely upon it.

In determining materiality, you should consider that naivety, carelessness, negligence, or stupidity of the victim does not excuse criminal conduct, if any, on the part of the defendant.

The word "knowingly," as that term has been used from time to time in these instructions, means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally, not because of mistake or accident.

In this case the defendant is charged with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

multiple offenses called "counts," for wire fraud, mail fraud, possessing or carrying a firearm during commission of a crime of violence, and bank theft. A current copy of the Fourth Superseding Indictment will be provided to you for deliberations. So Counts 1 through 6, 9 through 14, and 20, wire fraud, 18 USC, Section 1343. The defendant is charged in Counts 1 through 6, 9 through 14, and 20 of the Fourth Superseding Indictment with the offense of wire fraud under Title 18 United States Code, Section 1343, which makes it a crime for anyone to use interstate wire communications in carrying out a scheme to defraud. For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime -- of these crimes for these various counts, you must be convinced that the government proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant knowingly devised or intended to devise any scheme to defraud. The scheme charged in this case is a scheme in which the defendant solicited money from victim investors for the purported investments, when in reality the funds were used for personal enrichment; Second, that the scheme to defraud employed false material representations or false material pretenses;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Third, that the defendant transmitted or caused to be transmitted by way of wire communications, in interstate commerce, any writing, sign, signal, picture, or sound for the purpose of executing such scheme; and, Fourth, that the defendant acted with a specific intent to defraud. Attempted wire fraud under 18 USC, Section 1349. The government can prove Counts 1 through 6, 9 through 14, and 20 by showing beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did or did "attempt" to commit the offense. It is a crime for anyone to attempt to commit a violation of certain specified laws of the United States. In this case defendant is charged in Counts 1 through 6, 9 through 14, and 20 of the Fourth Superseding Indictment with attempting to commit wire fraud under Title 18 United States Code, Section 1349. For you to find the defendant guilty of attempting to commit wire fraud, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant intended to commit wire fraud; and, Second, that the defendant did an act that constitutes a substantial step towards the commission of that crime and that strongly corroborates the defendant's

1 criminal intent and amounts to more than mere preparation. 2 Now, your verdict, whether it is guilty or not 3 quilty, must be unanimous. The following instruction 4 applies to the unanimity requirement as to Counts 1 through 6, 9 through 14, and 20. 5 Counts 1 through 6, 9 through 14, and 20 of the 6 7 Fourth Superseding Indictment charge the defendant with 8 committing the crime of wire fraud in two ways. The first is the defendant committed wire fraud. The second is the defendant attempted to commit 10 11 wire fraud. 12 The government does not have to prove both of 13 these for you to return a guilty verdict on Counts 1 through 6, 9 through 14, and Count 20. But in order to 14 return a quilty verdict, all of you must agree that the 15 same one has been proved. All of you must agree that the 16 government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the 17 18 defendant committed wire fraud, or all of you must agree 19 that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that 20 the defendant attempted to commit wire fraud. 21 Now, you should use the following instructions and 22 definitions in your deliberations on Counts 1 through 6, 9 23 through 14, and 20. 24 A "scheme to defraud" means any plan, pattern, or 25 course of action intended to deprive another of money or

1 property or bring about some financial gain to the person 2 engaged in the scheme. A "specific intent to defraud" means a conscious, 3 4 knowing intent to deceive or cheat someone. A representation or pretense is "false" if it is 5 known to be untrue or is made with reckless indifference to 6 7 its truth or falsity. A representation or pretense would also be "false" if it constitutes a half-truth or 8 effectively omits or conceals a material fact, provided it is made with the intent to defraud. 10 11 A representation or pretense is "material" if it 12 has a natural tendency to influence or is capable of 13 influencing the decision of the person or entity to which 14 it is addressed. 15 "Interstate commerce" means commerce or travel 16 between one state, territory, or possession of the United States and another state, territory, or possession of the 17 United States, including the District of Columbia. 18 19 It is not necessary that the government prove all 20 of the details alleged in the Indictment concerning the 21 precise nature and purpose of the scheme. What must be 22 proved beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant 23 knowingly devised or intended to devise a scheme to defraud 24 by means of false or fraudulent pretenses or 25 representations that were substantially the same as the one alleged in the Indictment.

It is also not necessary that the government prove that the material transmitted by wire communications was itself false or fraudulent or that the use of the interstate wire communications facilities was intended as the specific or exclusive means of accomplishing the alleged fraud. What must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt is that the use of the interstate wire communications facilities was closely related to the scheme between the defendant -- scheme because the defendant either wired something or caused it to be wired in interstate commerce in an attempt to execute or carry out the scheme.

The alleged scheme need not actually succeed in defrauding anyone.

To "cause" interstate wire communications facilities to be used is to do an act with knowledge that the use of the wire communications facilities will follow in the ordinary course of business or where such use can reasonably be foreseen.

Each separate use of interstate wire communications facilities in furtherance of a scheme to defraud by means of false or fraudulent pretenses or false or fraudulent representations constitutes a separate offense.

Should you find the defendant quilty to any of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Counts 1 through 6 in Fourth Superseding Indictment, you will then need to determine if the wire fraud affected a financial institution. The term "financial institution" means federally insured depository institutions. A "financial institution" is affected when there is an increased risk of laws lot caused by the fraudulent This remains true even if the "financial scheme. institution" suffered no loss -- the increased risk of loss is sufficient. Counts 15 through 16, mail fraud, 18 United States Code, Section 1341. The defendant is charged in Counts 15 and 16 of the Fourth Superseding Indictment with the offense of mail fraud under Title 18 United States Code, Section 1341, which makes it a crime for anyone to use the mails, including any private or commercial interstate carrier, in carrying out a scheme to defraud. For you to find the defendant guilty of these crimes, you must be convinced that the government proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt for each count: First, that the defendant knowingly devised or intended to devise a scheme to defraud. Here, the defendant is charged with a scheme to obtain money by means

of false and fraudulent pretenses and representations; 1 2 Second, that the scheme to defraud employed false 3 material representations or false material pretenses; 4 Third, that the defendant mailed something or caused something to be sent and/or delivered through the 5 U.S. Postal Service or a private or commercial interstate 6 7 carrier for the purpose of executing such scheme or 8 attempting to do so; and, Fourth, that the defendant acted with a specific intent to defraud. 10 11 The government can prove Counts 15 and 16 by 12 showing beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did or 13 did "attempt" to commit the offense. It is a crime for 14 anyone to attempt to commit a violation of certain 15 specified laws of the United States. In this case the 16 defendant is charged in Counts 15 and 16 of the Fourth 17 Superseding Indictment with attempting to commit mail fraud 18 under Title 18 United States Code, Section 1349. to find the defendant guilty of attempting to commit wire 19 20 fraud -- mail fraud, excuse me -- you must be convinced 21 that the government has proved each of the following beyond 22 a reasonable doubt: 23 First, that the defendant intended to commit mail 24 fraud; and, 25 Second, that the defendant did an act that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

constitutes a substantial step towards the commission of that crime and that strongly corroborates the defendant's criminal intent and amounts to more than mere preparation. Your verdict, whether it is quilty or not quilty, The following instruction applies to must be unanimous. the unanimity requirement as to Counts 15 and 16. Counts 15 and 16 of the Fourth Superseding Indictment charge the defendant with committing the crime of mail fraud in two ways. The first is that the defendant committed mail fraud. The second is that the defendant attempted to commit mail fraud. The government does not have to prove both of these for you to return a guilty verdict on Counts 15 and 16; but in order to return a guilty verdict, all of you must agree that the same one has been proved. All of you must agree that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed mail fraud, or all of you must agree that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant attempted to commit mail fraud. You should use the following instructions and definitions in your deliberations on Counts 15 and 16. A "scheme to defraud" means any plan, pattern, or

course of action intended to deprive another of property or money or bring about some financial gain to the person engaged in the scheme.

A "specific intent to defraud" means a conscious, knowing intent to deceive or cheat someone.

A representation or pretense is "false" if it is known to be untrue or is made with reckless indifference as to the truth or falsity. A representation or pretense would also be "false" if it constitutes a half-truth or effectively omits or conceals a material fact provided it is made with the intended to defraud.

A representation or pretense is "material" if it has a natural tendency to influence or is capable of influencing the decision of the person or entity to which it is addressed.

"Interstate commerce" means commerce or travel between one state, territory, or possession of the United States and another state, territory, or possession of the United States, including the District of Columbia.

It is not necessary that the government prove all of the details alleged in the Indictment concerning the precise nature and purpose of the scheme. What must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant knowingly devised or intended to devise a scheme to defraud by means of false or fraudulent pretenses or

representations that was substantially the same as the one alleged in the Indictment.

It is also not necessary that the government prove that the mailed material or material sent by private or commercial interstate carrier was itself false or fraudulent or that the use of the mail or a private or commercial interstate carrier was intended as the specific or exclusive means of accomplishing the alleged fraud.

What must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt is that the use of the mails, including the use of private or commercial interstate carriers, was closely related to the scheme because the defendant either mailed something or caused it to be mailed or the defendant either sent or delivered something or caused it to be sent or delivered by a private or commercial interstate carrier in an attempt to execute or carry out the scheme.

The alleged scheme need not actually have succeeded in defrauding anyone.

To "cause" the mails or private or commercial interstate carrier to be used is to do an act with knowledge that the use of the mails, including the use of a private or commercial interstate carrier, will follow in the ordinary course of business or where such use can reasonably be foreseen even though the defendant did not intend or request the mails, including a private or

commercial interstate carrier, to be used. 1 2 Each separate use of the mails, including the use 3 of a private or commercial interstate carrier, in 4 furtherance of a scheme to defraud by means of false or fraudulent pretenses or false or fraudulent representations 5 constitutes a separate offense. 6 7 Count 18, possessing or carrying a firearm during the commission of a crime of violence, 18 United States 8 Code, Section 924(c)(1) and (j). 9 The defendant is charged in Count 18 of the Fourth 10 11 Superseding Indictment with the offense of carrying or 12 discharging a firearm during a crime of violence or possession of a firearm in furtherance of a crime of 13 14 violence causing death or murder by robbery under Title 18 15 United States Code, Sections 924(c)(1) and (j). Title 18 United States Code, Section 924(c)(1) 16 17 makes it a crime for anyone to knowingly carry a firearm 18 during and in relation to a crime of violence or to 19 knowingly possess a firearm in furtherance of a crime of 20 violence. 21 For you to find the defendant quilty of this crime 22 under Section 924(c)(1), you must be convinced that the 23 government proved each of the following beyond a reasonable 24 doubt: 25 First, that the defendant committed the crime of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

affecting commerce by robbery, in violation of 18 United States Code, Section 1951(a), as set forth in the subsection titled "D, Affecting Commerce by Robbery, 18 USC, Section 1951, Hobbs Act," on pages 26 through 29 of these instructions. I instruct you that affecting commerce by robbery is a crime of violence; and, Second, that the defendant knowingly carried a firearm during and in relation to the defendant's commission of the crime of affecting commerce by robbery, or that the defendant knowingly possessed a firearm and that possession was in furtherance of the defendant's commission of the crime of affecting commerce by robbery. The events presented at trial happened in various You are hereby instructed that when an offense is begun in one district and completed in another, venue is proper in any district in which the offense was begun, continued, or completed. In order for you to return a quilty verdict, the government must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the offense began, continued, or was completed in the Eastern District of Texas. This is a fact that the government has to prove only by a preponderance of the evidence, which means that it is more likely than not so. All of the other elements of the offense must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You should use the following instructions and definitions in your deliberations regarding carrying or discharging a firearm during a crime of violence or possession of a firearm in furtherance of a crime of violence under Title 18 United States Code, Section 924(c)(1): To prove the defendant "carried" a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, the government must prove that the defendant carried the firearm in the ordinary meaning of the word "carry," such as transporting a firearm on the person or in a vehicle. The defendant's carrying of the firearm cannot be merely coincidental or unrelated to the crime of violence. "In relation to" means that the firearm must have some purpose, role, or effect with respect to the crime of violence. To prove that the defendant possessed a firearm "in furtherance" of the crime of violence, the government must prove that the defendant possessed a firearm that furthered, advanced, or helped forward that crime. Affecting commerce by robbery, 18 USC, Section 1951, Hobbs Act. Title 18 United States Code, Section 1951(a) makes it a crime for anyone to obstruct, delay, or affect commerce by robbery.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Robbery" means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property or anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining. For you to find that the defendant committed this crime, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant unlawfully obtained personal property from a person or in his presence, against his will; Second, that the defendant did so by means of actual or threatened force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, property in his custody or possession, or anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining; and, Third, that the defendant's conduct in any way or degree obstructed, delayed, or affected commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce. You should use the following instructions and definitions in your deliberations regarding affecting commerce by robbery under Title 18 United States Code, Section 1951(a): The government is not required to prove that the

defendant knew that his conduct would obstruct, delay, or affect commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce.

It is not necessary for the government to show that the defendant actually intended or anticipated an effect on commerce by his actions.

All that is necessary is that the natural and probable consequence of the acts the defendant took would be to affect commerce. If you decide that there would be any effect at all on commerce, that is enough to satisfy this element.

A robbery of an individual affects interstate commerce if the robbery depletes the assets of an individual who is directly and customarily engaged in interstate commerce, or the robbery causes or creates the likelihood that the individual will deplete the assets of an entity engaged in interstate commerce, or the number of individuals victimized or the sum at stake is so large that there will be some cumulative effect on interstate commerce.

"Interstate commerce" means commerce or travel between one state, territory, or possession of the United States and another state, territory, or possession of the United States, including the District of Columbia.

The term "personal property" includes money and

other tangible things of value. 1 The term "commerce" means commerce within the 2 District of Columbia; commerce within the territory or 3 4 possession of the United States; all commerce between any 5 point in a state, territory, or possession or the District of Columbia and any point outside thereof; all commerce 6 7 between points within the same state through anyplace outside such state; or all other commerce over which the 8 United States has jurisdiction. 9 10 "Affecting commerce" means that there is any 11 effect at all on interstate or foreign commerce, however 12 minimal. 13 Should you find the defendant guilty of 18 United 14 States Code, Section 924(c)(1), you will then need to 15 determine whether, in the course of so doing, the defendant 16 caused the death of a person through the use of a firearm. If you so find, you must next find whether the killing is a 17 murder within the meaning of 18 USC, Section 1111. 18 elements of murder are set forth in the subsection below. 19 20 Murder (first degree) 18 USC, Section 1111. 21 Title 18 United States Code, Section 1111(a), 22 makes it a crime for anyone to murder another human being 23 with premeditation in the commission, or attempted 24 commission, of certain felonies. 25 For you to find the defendant committed this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

crime, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant unlawfully killed J.S.; Second, that the defendant killed J.S. with malice aforethought; and, Third, that the killing was premeditated. You should use the following instructions and definitions in your deliberations regarding murder under Title 18 United States Code, Section 1111(a). To kill "with malice aforethought" means either to kill another person deliberately and intentionally or to act with callous and wanton disregard for human life. find malice aforethought, you need not be convinced that the defendant acted out of spite, hatred, malevolence, or ill will toward the victim. In deciding whether the killing was with malice aforethought, you may consider the use of a weapon or instrument and the manner in which the death was caused. A killing is "premeditated" when it is the result of planning or deliberation. The amount of time needed for premeditation of a killing depends on the person and the circumstances. It must be long enough for the killer, after forming the intent to kill, to be fully conscious of that intent. You should consider all the facts and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
circumstances before, during, and after the killing which
shed light on the defendant's state of mind, before and at
the time of the kill.
        Count 19, bank theft, 18 USC, Section 2113(b).
        The defendant is also charged in Count 19 of the
Fourth Superseding Indictment with the offense of bank
theft under Title 18 United States Code, Section 2113(b),
which makes it a crime for anyone to take and carry away,
with the intent to steal or purloin, any property or money
or any other thing of value exceeding $1,000 belonging to
or in the care, custody, control, management, or possession
of any federally insured bank.
        For you to find the defendant guilty of this
crime, you must be convinced that the government proved
each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt:
        First, that the defendant did or did attempt to
take and carry away money and property belonging to or in
the care, custody, control, management, possession of Texas
Capital Bank;
        Second, that at that time Texas Capital Bank had
its deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance
Corporation;
        Third, that the defendant did or did attempt to
take and carry away such money and property with the intent
to steal; and,
```

1 Fourth, that such money and property exceeded 2 \$1,000 in value. 3 The government can prove Count 19 by showing 4 beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did or did "attempt" to commit the offense. It is a crime for anyone 5 to attempt to commit a violation of certain specified laws 6 7 of the United States. In this case the defendant is 8 charged in Count 19 with attempting to commit bank fraud (sic) under Title 18 United States Code, Section 1349. 10 11 For you to find the defendant quilty of attempting 12 to commit bank fraud (sic), you must be convinced that the 13 government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: 14 15 First, that the defendant intended to commit bank 16 theft; and, 17 Second, that the defendant did an act that 18 constitutes a substantial step towards the commission of 19 that crime and that strongly corroborates the defendant's criminal intent and amounts to more than mere preparation. 20 21 Your Honor, may we approach? MS. RATTAN: 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 (Sidebar conference off the record.) 24 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going 25 to instruct you the statute is -- on page 32, attempted

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bank theft is actually in violation of Title 18 United States Code 2113(b). So I'm going to reread that and make that change both on that B paragraph. So the government can prove Count 19 by showing beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did or did "attempt" to commit the offense. It is a crime for anyone to attempt to commit a violation of certain specified laws of the United States. In this case the defendant is charged in Count 19 with attempting to commit bank theft under Title 18 United States Code, Section 2113(b). For you to find the defendant quilty of attempting to commit bank theft, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant intended to commit bank theft; and, Second, that the defendant did an act that constitutes a substantial step towards the commission of that crime and that strongly corroborates the defendant's criminal intent and amounts to more than mere preparation. Again, your verdict, whether it is guilty or not quilty, must be unanimous. The following instruction applies to the unanimity requirement as to Count 19. Count 19 of the Fourth Superseding Indictment charges the defendant with committing the crime of bank

1 theft in two ways. 2 The first is that the defendant committed bank theft. 3 4 The second is that the defendant attempted to commit bank theft. 5 6 The government does not have to prove both of 7 these for you to return a quilty verdict for Count 19; but 8 in order to return a quilty verdict, all of you must agree that the same one has been proved. All of you must agree 10 that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that 11 the defendant committed bank theft, or all of you must 12 agree that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt 13 that the defendant attempted to commit bank theft. 14 Now, the events presented in this trial happened 15 in various places. You are hereby instructed that when an 16 offense is begun in one district and completed in another, 17 venue is proper in any district in which the offense was 18 begun, continued, or completed. 19 In order for you to return a guilty verdict, the 20 government must prove by a preponderance of the evidence 21 that the offense began, continued, or was completed in the 22 Eastern District of Texas. This is a fact that the 23 government has to prove only by a preponderance of the 24 evidence, which means that it is more likely than not. All 25 other elements of the offense must be proved beyond a

reasonable doubt. 1 You should use the following instructions and 2 definitions in your deliberations on Count 19. 3 A "federally insured bank" means any bank with 4 deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance 5 Corporation. 6 7 Should you find the defendant guilty of this 8 crime, you will then need to determine whether the defendant, in committing the violation, or in avoiding or attempting to avoid apprehension for committing the 10 11 offense, or in freeing himself or attempting to free 12 himself from arrest or confinement for the offense, killed 13 J.S. To reach a verdict, whether it is quilty or 14 Okav. 15 not quilty, all of you must agree. Your verdict must be unanimous on each count of the Fourth Superseding 16 Indictment. Your deliberations will be secret. You will 17 18 never have to explain your verdict to anyone. 19 It is your duty to consult with one another and to 20 deliberate in an effort to reach an agreement if you can do 21 so. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but 22 only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with 23 your fellow jurors. During your deliberations do not 24 hesitate to reexamine your own opinions and change your 25 mind if you're convinced you were wrong. But do not give

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

up your honest beliefs as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict. Remember at all times you are the judges, judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case, to decide whether the government has proven the defendant quilty beyond a reasonable doubt as to each count. Any notes that you have taken during the trial are only aids to your memory. If your memory should be different from your notes, then you should rely on your memory and not on the notes. The notes are not evidence. A juror who has not taken notes should rely on his or her own independent recollection of the evidence and should not be unduly influenced by the notes of other jurors. are not entitled to any greater weight than the recollection or impression of each juror about the testimony. When you go to the jury room, the first thing you should do is select one of your members as your foreperson, who will help quide your deliberations and will speak for you here in the courtroom. A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience. The foreperson will write the unanimous answer of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the jury in the space provided for each count of the Fourth Superseding Indictment, either "quilty" or "not quilty." At the conclusion of your deliberations, the foreperson should sign and date the verdict and use his or her initials. And I will be sending each of you a copy of the verdict. Of course, only the foreperson will fill out the one for -- to return to the Court. But this goes through -- and you don't have this yet, but we'll send this It just says "Verdict of the Jury." And then up to you. the first one are the wire fraud counts, Counts 1 through 6; and then it just goes through the various questions and then there are what I call hooks or instructions after each question based on how you answer. Like Question 1, as to the offense charged in Count 1 of the Fourth Superseding Indictment, we, the jury, find the defendant, Keith Todd Ashley -- there is a space for quilty or not quilty. And so that goes through all the various counts up through Count 20, and then the last page is just -- again, I want the foreperson to just initial it because we want to keep your name out of the record as well. Now, during your deliberations you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone by any means about this case. You must not use any electronic

device or media, such as a telephone, cell phone, 1 2 smartphone, iPhone, BlackBerry, or computer; the Internet, any Internet service or any text or instant messaging 3 service; or any Internet chat room, blog, or website such 5 as Facebook, MySpace, LinkedIn, YouTube, or Twitter to communicate to anyone any information about this case or to 6 7 conduct any research about this case until I accept your 8 verdict. If you need to communicate with me during your 10 deliberations, the foreperson should write the message and 11 give it to the court security officer. I will either reply 12 in writing or bring you back into the courtroom to respond 13 to your inquiry. 14 Bear in mind that you are never to reveal to any 15 person, not even to the Court, how the jury stands, 16 numerically or otherwise, on any count of the Fourth 17 Superseding Indictment until you've reached a unanimous 18 verdict. And let me just give you a couple other 19 20 instructions. So all communications will be by note. So 21 if you have a question, you don't ask the court security 22 They are super nice and want to be helpful. 23 actually put it in a note and send it back to the Court, 24 and then I will respond in kind. 25 The other thing is when you go up to the jury

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

room, the first thing you will do will be to select one of your own to be your foreperson; and that will be Note Number 1 you send back to the jury. That will be Juror Number 1 through 12 is the foreperson. The other thing is -- is that under the law the alternates cannot deliberate, so that would be Juror So you have one of two options. When you go Number 13. back to the jury room, you can leave. I don't make you stay here. If you want to stay here, we can find you a place to; but you are welcome to leave if you want to leave. But, Juror 13, you are still under the same instructions. You can't talk about the case with anyone else because there is always a possibility you could get called back. If we reach a verdict, you will get notified if you decide to go back home and we'll notify you and then once you've been notified of the verdict, you are free to talk about the case as much as you want. The other thing is for the 12 of you, once you go back up and just 12 of you are present, then select your foreperson; and you can then begin deliberations. We will also send in the exhibits. You have a copy of the charge you can take with you, and we will send each of you a copy of the -- the Fourth Superseding Indictment be sent up. And then also I have a copy of the

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

verdict for each one of you so it's easier for you to follow along. We used to only send one copy of the verdict, but then after my last trial -- this is my 103rd jury trial. The last jury actually asked can each of us have a copy of the verdict. And so that makes sense. don't know why we've never really done that. So I'll send each of you a copy of that as well. The one thing to remember is if you take a break, deliberations have to cease. Doesn't mean you can't individually look through the evidence as you so desire; but, again, all 12 of you must be present during deliberations. The other thing is, of course, you're going to start deliberations. If we come up to the lunch hour, all I need is -- you don't need my permission. If you want to leave to -- just send a note saying, "We're going to leave for lunch." And if you want to leave, you can leave from Just remember all of my prior instructions 12:00 to 1:00. are still under -- you can't talk about the case or anything if you-all go to lunch from 12:00 to 1:00. If you want like lunch brought in, we can certainly do that, too, for the 12 of you. And just send that note, or you can tell -- when the exhibits are brought up, you can tell them if you want lunch brought in. But if we bring lunch in, the attorneys will probably be gone from

```
12:00 to 1:00. I'll give them a break during that time
1
 2
   period while you are doing a working lunch.
            So, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your
 3
 4
   attentiveness over these seven days. You've been a great
   jury, and I'm going to send you back to the jury room to
 5
   basically begin your deliberations.
                                         The case is now in
 6
 7
   your hands.
                Thank you.
 8
            (The jury exits the courtroom, 9:59 a.m.)
 9
            THE COURT: Okay. Anything further from the
10
   government?
11
            MS. RATTAN:
                        No, your Honor.
12
            THE COURT:
                        Anything further from defense?
13
            MR. WHALEN: No, your Honor.
14
            THE COURT:
                        And then if you want to wait around,
15
   the attorneys -- I assume we'll get a note pretty quickly,
16
   if you want to know who the foreperson is. Otherwise, I
   will -- once we get a second note, I'll put that one on the
17
18
   record, the first note who the foreperson is. But I will
19
   come out and tell you if you -- are y'all interested in who
20
   the foreperson is?
21
            MS. RATTAN: Yes, your Honor.
22
                       Okay.
                               So when I get that note, I'll
            THE COURT:
23
   come out. Just stay here. It shouldn't take too long.
24
            And then after that, if you want to go to your
25
   respective rooms; and then I'll also let you know if they
```

```
decide they want to go out for lunch or have lunch brought
1
 2
        I'll let you know that. But either way, you can take
   12:00 to 1:00 for lunch.
 3
 4
            Okay. Very good. Thank y'all.
            (Recess, 10:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.)
 5
            (Open court, defendant present, jury present.)
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Okay. We have Note Number 1, which
   is -- they didn't identify it as Note Number 1 but -- they
 8
   didn't put a number on there, but I am going to add "1"
10
   just so it's the first note. It's the foreperson -- any
11
   quesses from the attorneys before --
12
            MS. RATTAN:
                         4?
13
            MR. WHALEN: No. I have no quess.
14
            THE COURT: Okay. I'm never good at this.
15
   Number 1 is the foreperson.
            MR. WHALEN: He drew the short straw.
16
17
            THE COURT:
                        Okay. And then I have a Note Number 2
18
   that was handed to me while I was waiting here so --
19
    "Question:
               May we have the timeline board that the U.S.
20
   Attorney prepared?"
21
            MS. RATTAN: Of course, we're willing to provide
22
   it.
23
            THE COURT:
                        Well, that's very nice of you to be so
24
   generous; but unlike the Jordan case, you didn't offer
25
   this.
```

```
1
            MS. RATTAN:
                        We agree. We did not.
 2
            THE COURT:
                        It's a demonstrative so --
 3
            MS. RATTAN:
                        Yes.
 4
            THE COURT:
                        I assume the defense isn't agreeing to
 5
   allowing that timeline to go back.
 6
                        No, we don't agree to that, your
            MR. WHALEN:
7
   Honor.
 8
            THE COURT: Okay. So I'll respond to the second
   note that -- essentially, that the timeline board was a
 9
   demonstrative and not an admitted exhibit --
10
11
            MS. RATTAN: Yes, your Honor.
12
            THE COURT: -- so the Court cannot provide that to
13
   you.
14
            MS. RATTAN: Yes, your Honor.
15
            THE COURT: Okay. She's preparing the note; and
16
   while she is doing that, I did want to raise a question
17
   regarding Count 19. Of course, the government pointed out
18
   that on the "attempt" language, that we had the wrong
19
   provision. Well, that raises the question. Under 2113(b)
20
   attempt is not listed as a crime, only the completed
21
   offense.
22
                         Under 31, I believe, (c) of the Rules
            MS. RATTAN:
   of Criminal Procedure attempt is automatically inherently
23
24
   included in every charge.
25
            THE COURT:
                        Well, but I'm saying is -- I don't
```

```
know that -- how does that counteract to the statute?
1
 2
   There is only -- the Circuit has -- in our quick research,
   only one Circuit has addressed this and -- but the issue
 3
   of -- (a) actually provides for attempt and (d) provides
 5
   for that, but (b) does not.
            MS. RATTAN: Again, I think that the Code of
 6
7
   Criminal Procedure says, under 31(c), that the charge of
 8
   attempt is automatically included in any crime that's
   charged.
10
            THE COURT: Okay. What rule is that again?
11
                        It's procedure, 31(c), I believe.
            MS. RATTAN:
12
                        Mr. Whalen, Rule 31 of the Criminal
            THE COURT:
13
   Rules of Procedure does provide that a defendant may be
14
   found quilty of any of the following:
15
            One, an offense necessarily included in the
16
   offense charged;
17
            Two, an attempt to commit the offense charged; or,
18
            Three, an attempt to commit an offense necessarily
   included in the offense charged, if the attempt is an
19
20
   offense in its own right.
21
            MR. WHALEN: Just one moment, your Honor.
22
            THE COURT:
                        That's fine.
23
            And then let me just -- so I can go ahead and send
24
   the note back to the jury, the typewritten response is:
25
    "Response to Jury Note Number 2: The timeline board was a
```

```
demonstrative and not an admitted exhibit.
1
                                                The Court
 2
   cannot provide this to you."
            Any objection to me answering it that way is this.
 3
 4
            MS. RATTAN: No, your Honor.
                        Mr. Whalen?
 5
            THE COURT:
                        No objection to that, your Honor.
 6
            MR. SANDEL:
 7
                        Okay. I'm going to go ahead and sign
            THE COURT:
 8
   that and send it back to the jury with Note Number 2.
 9
            MR. WHALEN: Your Honor.
10
            THE COURT:
                        Yes.
11
                        I don't know how to -- just -- these
            MR. WHALEN:
12
   are just my musings on it but -- 31(c) does say that, but I
13
   also think why (b) doesn't have attempt in it, I guess, the
14
   special issue does, when they mentioned (d). So, I quess
15
   they couldn't find an attempt of (b) -- and it gets pretty
16
   convoluted, but I think 31(c) does it allow it to -- they
17
   can plead an attempt the way I understood it but --
18
            THE COURT:
                        So you don't think there's a -- you
   don't think there's an issue here?
19
20
            MR. WHALEN: It doesn't -- on its face it doesn't
21
   appear to be.
22
            THE COURT: Okay. Very good. I just wanted to
23
   raise it while there was still a chance to -- if we had to
24
   fix something, we could fix it.
25
            Okay. Very good. Again -- oh, the other thing
```

```
I'll just let you know is the jury did ask for lunch to be
1
 2
   brought in. So the attorneys are welcome -- we're going to
   be providing them lunch; but you are welcome to -- just if
 3
 4
   you want to leave the building from 12:00 to 1:00, I've
   already told them that, you know, they'll have a working
 5
   lunch and we'll be gone during that time.
 6
 7
            Otherwise, we will await the jury's verdict.
   Thank y'all.
 8
            (Recess, 10:37 a.m. to 11:27 a.m.)
            (Open court, defendant present, jury not present.)
10
11
            THE COURT: Okav. We received another note from
12
   the jury and it's not numbered, but we'll number it
13
   Number 3.
            "Can we receive multiple copies of the Indictment,
14
15
   preferably one for each juror?"
            Of course, we sent up the redacted version, one
16
          If there is no objection, I'll just have Ms. McCord
17
   go up and obtain the redacted version that you've already
18
19
   signed off on and make the copies.
20
            Any objection to that?
21
            MS. RATTAN:
                        No, your Honor.
22
                         No, your Honor.
            MR. WHALEN:
23
            THE COURT:
                        Okay. So I think instead of just
24
   responding to the note -- I'm not going to give a written
25
   response. I'll just provide -- we'll obtain that, make the
```

```
1
   copies, and provide it to them.
 2
            Is that suitable?
                         That's fine, your Honor.
 3
            MR. WHALEN:
 4
            MS. RATTAN: Yes, your Honor.
 5
            THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
            Again we continue to await the jury's verdict.
 6
7
   Thank you.
 8
            (Recess, 11:28 a.m. to 1:56 p.m.)
 9
            (Open court, defendant present, jury not present.)
10
            THE COURT: We have another note from the jury,
11
   and they didn't -- they didn't put the number, but I think
12
   this is Note Number 4.
            "Would Ashley's actions in Count 9 be considered
13
   wire fraud if J.S. were still alive?"
14
15
            That is the question that they are asking.
16
   comment from the government?
17
            MS. RATTAN: I think that the Court just has to
18
   instruct them that they've received the evidence and the
19
   instructions and they need to focus on that and not provide
20
   anything additional.
21
            MR. WHALEN: I agree, your Honor.
22
            THE COURT: So I would propose that we just
23
   respond indicating "The Court refers you back to the
24
   Court's instructions, " just that.
25
            Does that sound okay?
```

```
That's fine, your Honor.
 1
            MR. WHALEN:
            MS. RATTAN:
 2
                          So can we include "and the evidence
   that you've received"?
 3
 4
            THE COURT: Oh, that's fine, yes.
 5
            MS. RATTAN:
                         Okay.
                         So "The Court refers you back to the
 6
            THE COURT:
 7
   Court's Final Jury Instructions as well as all of the
   evidence of record." Does that work?
 8
            MR. WHALEN:
                          It does, your Honor.
10
            THE COURT: Okay.
                               She's going to type it up, and
11
   then I'll read it one more time to make sure we're all in
12
   agreement.
13
            So here is my response. The typewritten note
14
   says, "Response to Jury Note Number 4: The Court refers
15
   you back to the Court's Final Jury Instructions and the
   evidence of record."
16
17
            Is that --
18
            MS. RATTAN:
                          We agree.
19
            THE COURT:
                        -- acceptable?
20
            MR. WHALEN: Yeah, that's acceptable.
21
                         Okay. I will sign that and again
            THE COURT:
22
   respond back to the note.
23
            I did want to raise one other issue, the issue I
24
   raised before regarding Count 19 and the issue of attempt.
25
   I know the government asserted that criminal Rule 31(c)
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
says that attempt can be asserted in any of those counts or
          The Fifth Circuit has not ruled upon this.
in our preliminary research, the Circuits that have
addressed it have indicated that the Rules of Criminal
Procedure doesn't expand upon whatever the statute says; so
the statute has to say that it includes attempt.
        So if the statute says it includes attempt, then
Rule 31 comes into play; but it can be any of those.
But -- and the Fifth Circuit hasn't ruled on that but -- so
that could be a concern since the statute that the
government asserted to proceed to the jury on does not
provide for attempt.
        Now, there may be some arguments about statutory
construction and having a look at the various provisions.
One thing that I'm just throwing out as a consideration is
if the jury convicts on Count 19, I would ask the parties
to ponder whether or not it is appropriate for the Court to
then send another -- supplemental interrogatory back to
find out did the jury convict him of the actual offense or
did they convict him of the attempt, so then we know the
        If it's the underlying offense, there is no issue.
answer.
If the attempt, then there is a posttrial issue we'll deal
with and I'm sure Mr. Whalen will raise.
        And I know if that's the way -- I know,
Mr. Whalen, you agree to -- that you think there is an
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
issue; but I don't know if that's -- if attempt is not
statutorily authorized as a crime, then that count won't
survive, if the jury found him guilty on the attempt and
that's what they were unanimous on.
        So any thoughts off the top of your head?
just thinking outside the box of trying to figure out if
they convict, since there were two ways they could convict.
Only one of those is problematic but -- or possibly
problematic. I'm not saying definitely the answer is
attempt couldn't be done, but I'm just trying to note that
since the issue has been -- at least I have an issue about
it, that I would like to see if there is a way to not --
it's too late to fix that, but it's a way to at least find
out what the jury decides on that count.
        Any thoughts?
        MS. RATTAN: A way to address it.
        Thank you for raising it. May we have an
opportunity to review it and talk about it --
        THE COURT: Of course.
        MS. RATTAN: -- talk about it and let the Court
know?
        THE COURT: Of course.
        Mr. Whalen, any thoughts?
        MR. WHALEN: No, and I think that -- let me think
about it, but I think that could be a solution.
                                                 I'm just
```

```
1
   trying to --
 2
            THE COURT: I mean, it doesn't solve the problem,
   you know, if they -- if we send them a supplemental
 3
 4
   interrogatory and they say they found him quilty of the
   attempt, then we'll deal with that post-trial and figure
 5
   out what that means.
 6
 7
            MR. WHALEN: Yeah, because I think that would then
 8
   impact the enhancement, the special issue, possibly.
 9
            THE COURT:
                        Well -- well, that goes to the
   underlying offense, the attempt issue. If attempt is not
10
11
   authorized, I'm not -- that's the underlying --
12
            MR. WHALEN:
                        Okay.
13
            THE COURT: -- underlying substantive count before
14
   the enhancement would apply.
15
            MR. WHALEN: Okay. We'll think about it.
            THE COURT: But I would ask both sides to look at
16
17
   it and, again -- at least it gives us a way to figure out
18
   did they find him quilty -- if they find him quilty of that
19
   count, what was the basis so --
20
            MR. WHALEN: Okay.
21
            THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
22
            Again, we will await the jury's verdict.
            (Recess, 2:03 p.m. to 3:17 p.m.)
23
24
            (Open court, defendant present, jury not present.)
25
            THE COURT: I have Note Number 5 from the jury.
```

```
1
    "Are we able to take a break and get fresh air, which
 2
   includes going outside?"
            So I will answer them, "Yes, you are free to take
 3
 4
   a break."
            Do you want me to give them a time limit or --
 5
            MS. RATTAN: It seems like 30 minutes would be
 6
7
   reasonable.
 8
            THE COURT: Oh, you're more generous than me.
                                                            I
   was going to say 20 minutes but -- so "You are free to take
 9
10
   a 20-minute break, which means you are allowed to go
11
   outside. Please remember to follow all of my previous
12
   instructions."
13
            Anything else you would like me to add?
14
            MS. RATTAN:
                        No, your Honor.
15
                        No, your Honor.
            MR. WHALEN:
16
            I mean, my only thought would be as far as putting
17
   a limit on it. I mean, it's always been their prerogative
18
   of how they deliberate and how long and stuff so --
19
            THE COURT: Okay. So let me just -- I'll take
20
   that out.
21
            So, "Yes, you are able to take a short break"?
22
            MR. WHALEN:
                         Sure.
23
            THE COURT:
                        Without defining the time.
24
            Okay. So the written response is, "Response to
25
   Jury Note Number 5: Yes, you are free to take a short
```

```
1
   break, which means you are allowed to go outside.
                                                        Please
 2
   remember to follow all my previous instructions."
 3
            Acceptable to the government?
 4
            MS. RATTAN: Yes, your Honor.
            THE COURT:
                        To defense?
 5
                        Yes, your Honor.
 6
            MR. WHALEN:
 7
                        Okay. I'll go ahead and sign it.
            THE COURT:
                        And we'll deliver that note to the
 8
            Thank you.
 9
   jury.
            Also, as we discussed earlier -- I don't know if
10
11
   you had a chance to discuss the issue of -- well, I think
12
   you've sent an email, from the government.
13
            Mr. Whalen, have you had a chance to -- well, the
14
   government indicated they agreed with my general proposal
15
   of a supplemental instruction.
16
            MR. WHALEN: Your Honor, after reviewing it,
17
   obviously the case law seems to suggest it's disfavored --
18
                           I'm sorry, could you --
            THE REPORTER:
19
            THE COURT: Oh, you have to use a mic.
20
            MR. WHALEN: Yes, sir.
21
            In reading an opinion from the Fifth Circuit,
22
   Judge Costa seemed to indicate that they were disfavored
23
   but in certain circumstances they would be appropriate; and
   I think under the circumstances that we have here today,
24
25
   because it would lead to a potential verdict that is
```

```
1
   improper, that we're not opposed to a supplemental
 2
   instruction.
                        And I'm working on the language, but
 3
            THE COURT:
 4
   let me just read a draft that I've come up with.
                                                      It would
 5
   be a supplemental question. My thought was to repeat the
   language under Count 19. "As you were instructed, Count 19
 6
 7
   of the Fourth Superseding Indictment charges the defendant
   with committing the crime of bank fraud in two different
 8
   ways.
          The first is defendant committed bank fraud, meaning
10
   the four elements listed on page 31 of the Final Jury
11
   Instructions were proven by the government beyond a
12
   reasonable doubt. The second is the defendant attempted to
13
   commit bank fraud, meaning that the two elements listed on
14
   page 32 of the Final Jury Instructions were proven by the
15
   government beyond a reasonable doubt. You were instructed
16
   that all of you must agree the government proved that the
17
   defendant committed bank theft or that all of you must
18
   agree the government proved attempted bank theft in order
19
   to find the defendant guilty."
20
            Then it says: "Proceed to Supplemental
   Ouestion 1.
21
22
            "Supplemental Question 1: With respect to
23
   Count 19, we, the jury, found the defendant, Keith Todd
24
   Ashley, is guilty based on" -- and then, parentheses,
   select only one, closed parentheses, then has "bank theft"
25
```

```
or "attempted bank theft" where they could check; and then
1
 2
   it goes to initial the verdict.
            I'll print this. I'm making some changes.
 3
                                                         I read
 4
   the -- what I read to you included my changes. But how
   does that sound generally? I'll give you a copy to look at
 5
   just in case we need it but --
 6
 7
            MS. RATTAN:
                        Generally, it sounds good.
 8
            THE COURT:
                        Mr. Whalen?
 9
            MR. WHALEN:
                        Agree, your Honor.
10
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
11
                        It sounds relatively --
            MR. WHALEN:
12
            THE COURT:
                        So what I'll do is I'm having my
13
   lawyer -- we're making a few changes, and I'll give you a
14
   copy of this so you can look at and then -- just so we're
15
   ready and prepared if we need it.
16
            Anything further from the government?
17
            MS. RATTAN:
                        No, your Honor.
18
            THE COURT:
                        Anything further from defense?
19
            MR. WHALEN: No, your Honor.
20
            THE COURT: Okay. Then we will go back in recess
21
   while awaiting the jury verdict. Thank you.
22
            (Recess, 3:21 p.m. to 5:01 p.m.)
23
            (Open court, defendant present, jury not present.)
24
            THE COURT: Okay. We have Note Number 6. Of
25
   course, this came about 10 minutes ago. "As we have only
```

```
10 minutes, can we end early?"
1
 2
            So I'm just going to instruct them that -- "Please
   return tomorrow by 9:00 to begin your deliberations again.
 3
 4
   Again, follow all of my prior instructions."
 5
            MS. RATTAN:
                        Yes, your Honor.
            MR. WHALEN: No objection, your Honor.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Okay. So here I have the
 8
   written response. "Response to Jury Note Number 6: Please
   return tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. to continue deliberations.
   Again, please follow all of my previous instructions."
10
11
            Is that acceptable?
12
            MS. RATTAN: Yes, your Honor.
13
            MR. WHALEN: Yes, your Honor.
14
            THE COURT: Okay. I'll sign that and send that
15
   back to the jury, and then I will see y'all tomorrow
16
   morning -- well, we'll await the jury's verdict but they
   will resume tomorrow morning at 9:00 and I'll see y'all
17
18
   tomorrow at the next note.
19
            Thank y'all. Have a good evening.
20
            (Proceedings adjourned, 5:02 p.m.)
21
   COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
22
              I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THIS DATE, NOVEMBER 1,
   2022, THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD
23
   OF PROCEEDINGS.
24
                        /s/
                      CHRISTINA L. BICKHAM, CRR, RDR
25
```